

COMMENT ON THE FOREST/HOLTHUIS PROPOSALS RELATING
TO "PAGURUS" FABRICIUS, 1775 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER
DECAPODA)

(a) By

J. D. MACDONALD

(British Museum (Natural History), London)

R. B. PIKE

(Marine Station, Millport, Isle of Cumbrae, Scotland)

and

D. I. WILLIAMSON

(Marine Biological Station, Port Erin, Isle of Man)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.) 859)

(For the application in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 11 : 307—321)

(Letter dated 23rd March, 1956)

We enclose a joint comment on the status of the generic name *Pagurus* and related matters.

Of the three possible solutions to the *Pagurus* problem set out by Drs. Forest and Holthuis we favour the adoption of Solution 1. No ruling of the Commission can alter the fact that the name *Pagurus* has been and is being used for two different genera. The adoption of any of the suggested solutions would prevent ambiguity in future references to either of these genera. Let us, then, adopt the solution which does not involve use of the Plenary Powers.

We are unconvinced by the respective arguments of both Dr. Dollfus and Dr. Forest for the suppression of the name *Pagurus*. Should, however, the Commission decide to suppress this name we wish to stress that no obstacle should be placed to the raising to family rank of the two subfamilies known under Solution 1 as PAGURINAE and DARDANINAE (=DIOGENINAE). Such an obstacle would occur if the names *Pagurus* and PAGURINAE were suppressed but the family name PAGURIDAE retained, as proposed by Dr. Forest. That the two subfamilies PAGURINAE and DARDANINAE should be raised to family rank was implied by J. F. L. Hart (1937) (*Canad. J. Res. (D)* 15 : 179—220) and is proposed by us in a paper on the larvae of the British Paguridea (in preparation).

(b) By **JOHN S. GARTH**

(University of Southern California, Los Angeles)

(Letter dated 6th April 1956)

I should like to register with the Commission my support of the discussion and proposal of L. B. Holthuis regarding his joint application with J. Forest for a decision regarding the status of the generic name *Pagurus* Fabricius, 1775 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 11 : 307—321, 1955).

In view of the facts presented in Part 1 of the proposal, with which both authors are in agreement, it would seem evident that Solution 1, as argued by Dr. Holthuis, is the more acceptable. That this solution may be attained without recourse by the Commission to its Plenary Powers to suppress the rules makes it the preferred one to carcinologists who would like to see the rules largely self operative. Furthermore, this solution would tend to support action already taken by the Commission in rendering *Opinion* 11, rejection of which on the part of certain workers is largely responsible for the present state of confusion, according to Walton and Stevens (1955, *Bull. S. Calif. Acad. Sci.* 54 : 40—42).

That *Pagurus* is the oldest name in the group, the type genus of the subfamily, family, and section, the source of many vernacular derivations, and the root of most hermit crab genera are to me cogent reasons for its retention. The suppression of the name at the generic level and the retention of its higher level derivatives PAGURINAE, PAGURIDAE, and PAGURIDEA, as proposed by Dr. Forest, I find illogical. The little more than one page of actions required by the Commission to implement Solution 1, as compared to the two and a half pages of actions required to implement Solution 111, fairly demonstrates the relative simplicity of the Holthuis over the Forest solution, and to the former, therefore, I give unhesitating support.

